UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,230	02/03/2006	Gordon Bell	70257	9450
	26748 7590 08/27/2008 SYNGENTA CROP PROTECTION , INC.		EXAMINER	
PATENT AND TRADEMARK DEPARTMENT			PRYOR, ALTON NATHANIEL	
410 SWING ROAD GREENSBORO, NC 27409			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/27/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Occurrence	10/567,230	BELL ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	ALTON N. PRYOR	1616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	<b>J.</b> lely filed  the mailing date of this α  (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 Ma	ay 2008.					
· <u> </u>						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the	merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E.	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14,16 and 17</u> is/are pending in the a	polication					
,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6,9,10,12-14,16 and 17</u> is/are reject	ed.					
7) Claim(s) 7,8,11 is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa			, ,			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority updor 35 LLS C & 110(a)	(d) or (f)				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 0.5.0. § 119(a)	-(u) or (r).				
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	• •	' <u></u>	Stage			
application from the International Bureau			- 3			
	* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
	·					
Attachusent(s)						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO_413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P	atent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) [ Other:					

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's arguments filed 5/12/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Previous rejections not addressed below are withdrawn.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5,9,10,12 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aven (EP 1023832; 8/2/00). Aven teaches an aqueous, concentrate suspension comprising an alkylpolyglycosides (oil based adjuvant) and a hydrotrope. See page 5 paragraph 31. Aven teaches that the concentrate can comprise approximately 25% adjuvant (calculated from the addition of (g/L): 400 active, 500 adjuvant, 100 surfactant, and 800; then divided total value into 500 g/L adjuvant to arrive at about 25% adjuvant). See abstract. A suspension equates to dispersion of active particles (solid) in a liquid which meets the limitation of second phase (solid) being dispersed in a continuous phase. See abstract, paragraph 53. Aven also teaches the addition of a liquid active ingredient to the composition which meets the claim limitation of the second phase comprising a water-immiscible liquid. See paragraph 26. With respect to claim 12 the composition in about 25% oil based adjuvant meets the limitation of the oil base adjuvant comprising a dispersed agrochemical concentrate therein.

Application/Control Number: 10/567,230 Page 3

Art Unit: 1616

# Response to Applicants Arguments

The Applicants argue that Aven does not motivate a skill person to replace water soluble APGs with an oil based adjuvant. The Examiner argues that alkylpolyglycosides (APGs) such as Glucopons (polymeric structure) are combined with hydrotropes.

Glucopons are not water soluble; therefore, Glucopons are structurally considered lipophilic or hydrophobic which would characterize them as being oil soluble or oil-based compounds. See Aven page 5 lines 26-28.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6,13-15 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aven (EP 1023832) as applied to claims 1-5,9,10 above. Aven teaches that the suspension concentrates are processed by well established procedures including mixing and / or milling of actives with other substances such as solvents and adjuvants. See paragraphs 53,63,64. Aven teaches that the concentrate can be diluted in water. See paragraph 6. Aven does not specifically teach a) that the continuous phase is prepared first, b) the milling of the solid in water, c) the dilution of the concentrate in a spray tank of water or encapsulation of ingredients (the second phase). The specification does not provide results related to the formulation of the continuous phase first versus the methodology as recited in Aven. In the absence of such results, it is

Art Unit: 1616

obvious that the ordering of the steps will yield the same concentrate (possessing the same chemical and physical characteristics) since Aven and instant invention teaches the mixing / milling of the same chemicals. Both inventions disclose that the concentrate is diluted in water. Therefore whether the concentrate is diluted in spray tank or in some container is immaterial, i.e. the composition should be the same. In the absence of unexpected results, the concentrate diluted in the spray tank should be identical to the concentrate diluted in any other container. With respect to micro-encapsulation (encapsulation), it is standard practice to encapsulate materials to delay their release. This signifies a common practice in the herbicide art. There is nothing unobvious about encapsulating materials in the herbicide art. (e.g. see USPN 5708073).

### Response to Applicants' Argument

The Applicants argue that Aven does not motivate a skill person to replace water soluble APGs with an oil based adjuvant. The Examiner argues that alkylpolyglycosides (APGs) such as Glucopons (polymeric structure) are combined with hydrotropes.

Glucopons are not water soluble; therefore, Glucopons are structurally considered lipophilic or hydrophobic which would characterize them as being oil soluble or oil-based compounds. See Aven page 5 lines 26-28.

# Claim Objection

Claims 7,8 and 11 remain objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior does not teach or

Art Unit: 1616

suggest the instant invention comprising the second phase as a micro-emulsion or a third phase.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### Telephonic Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alton N. Pryor whose telephone number is 571-272-0621. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/567,230 Page 6

Art Unit: 1616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alton N. Pryor/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1616